

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10)**

Applicant(s): Thomas J. Lenosky

Docket No.

15436.253.81.2

Application No.

10/789,622

Filing Date

February 27, 2004

Examiner


Tesfaldet Bocure

Customer No.

022913

Group Art Unit

2631

Invention: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REDUCING INTERFERENCE IN A DATA STREAM USING AUTOCORRELATION DERIVED EQUALIZATION**

I hereby certify that the following correspondence:

Issue Fee Transmittal Letter (1 pg., in duplicate); PTOL-85B Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate); Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (1 pg.); PTO-2038 Credit Card Form in the amount of \$1,403.00 (1 pg.); postcard; and Certificate of Express Mailing Label No. EV 524 682 846 US

*(Identify type of correspondence)*

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

January 19, 2005*(Date)*ERIC L. MASCHOFF*(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)*

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Eric L. Maschoff".

*(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)*EV 524 682 846 US*("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)***Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.**



PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No: 15436.253.81.2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: )  
 )  
Thomas J. Lenosky )  
 )  
Serial No: 10/789,622 ) Art Unit  
 ) 2631  
Filed: February 27, 2004 )  
 )  
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REDUCING )  
INTERFERENCE IN A DATA STREAM USING )  
AUTOCORRELATION DERIVED EQUALIZATION )  
 )  
Examiner: Tesfaldet Bocure )

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communication mailed on October 19, 2004. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

ERIC L. MASCHOFF  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,596  
Customer No. 022913